

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Jesus Rodriguez Rodriquez,  
Plaintiff(s),  
vs.  
Charles Daniels, *et al.*,  
Defendant(s).

2:22-cv-01651-MMD-MDC

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
COURTESY COPIES (ECF NO. 35)**

With the apparent aid of an interpreter, plaintiff filed a *Motion for Courtesy Copies* (“Motion”). *ECF No. 35*. The Court denies the Motion. Plaintiff seeks paper copies of the filings on the Court’s docket. The Court denies plaintiff’s Motion for Copies because he is not entitled to free copies of documents from the Court. See e.g. *Allen v. Clark County Detention Center*, No. 10-857, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 31765, 2011 WL 886343 at \*2 (D. Nev. March 11, 2011) (“Plaintiff also requests that the Court provide him with file-stamped copies of any documents he files with the Court. (# 119). The Court will deny this request as plaintiff is not entitled to free copies of documents from the Court merely because he is proceeding in forma pauperis.”). Plaintiff currently receives his Court filings from the law library at High Desert State Prison and he can make a request to the law library for additional copies, or copies of misplaced or lost filings.

ACCORDINGLY,

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Jesus Rodriguez Rodriquez’s *Motion for Courtesy Copies (ECF No. 35)* is DENIED.

DATED July 21, 2025

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Maximiliano D. Couvillier III  
United States Magistrate Judge

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**NOTICE**

Pursuant to Local Rules IB 3-1 and IB 3-2, a party may object to orders and reports and recommendations issued by the magistrate judge. Objections must be in writing and filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen days. LR IB 3-1, 3-2. The Supreme Court has held that the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified time. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). This circuit has also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the District Court. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); *Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). Pursuant to LR IA 3-1, the plaintiff must immediately file written notification with the court of any change of address. The notification must include proof of service upon each opposing party's attorney, or upon the opposing party if the party is unrepresented by counsel. Failure to comply with this rule may result in dismissal of the action.

2